From: Jay Field
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: Hit/No-Hit Classifications
Date: 10/31/2010 07:40 PM

Eric,
no problem sending to LWG. I emailed Lucinda Tear in response to an email she sent last week.
I still would like to see their version of the data.
Jay

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Thanks, Jay. Can I send this over to John Toll and company? I would
> like them to see if they agree with your assessment. It sounds like
> there is nothing that would affect your model which is certainly good
> news.
>
> Eric
>
> From: Jay Field <Jay.Field@noaa.gov>
> To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> Cc: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Robert Neely <Robert.Neely@noaa.gov>, Jennifer Peterson <PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us>, POULSEN Mike <POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>
> Date: 10/31/2010 11:47 AM
> Subject: Re: Hit/No-Hit Classifications
>
> Eric,
> I've completed my review of the hit/no-hit classifications that I used
> in model development and evaluation. I found 3 stations (listed below)
> incorrectly classified as Level 1 hits for Chironomus: these stations
> had level 1 hits for survival that were not significant and level 0 for
> biomass that were significant. In the tables that I sent you
> previously, the individual threshold levels (shown as rtox_hy28s,
> rtox_hy28b, rtox_ch 10s, rtox_ch 10b) were based on the reference tox
> thresholds and did not take into account significance. This
> misunderstanding of the contents of the tables that I provided is
> probably the primary reason for the "discrepancy" in Chironomus toxicity
>
> classifications identified by LWG. Although I do not have LWG's T/C
> values to compare, any differences are likely due to rounding. As you
> can see from the bioassay data in our Query Manager tables, we
> maintained more decimal places in the response and control-

adjusted
values. We did this because of the subsequent calculations in an attempt to limit multiple rounding of values (we prefer to round at the
end of the calculations).

The endpoints that I used in model development and evaluation (the combined survival/biomass) endpoints (shown as rtox_hy and rtox_ch) were

adjusted for significance, with the exception of the three errors for
Level 1 Chironomus. Since all model calibration and evaluation was
based on Level 2 and greater hit levels, the three incorrectly classified Level 1 hits would have at most a trivial effect on the Level

1 models or the multi-chemical Pmax model development and evaluation.

Incorrectly classified stations as Level 1 hits for Chironomus: G011,
G230, G142
The attached file has the thresholds used for the toxicity classifications.

Please let me know if you need any additional clarification.
Jay

Jay Field wrote:

> Eric,
> I am reviewing the hit/no-hit classifications. At the meeting at
> Windward with LWG, I requested a table of LWG's test results (a table
>
> with response values for test and control, control-adjusted values,
> statistical significance, and toxicity classification level for all 4
> endpoints (as I provided). I need this file to complete my review.
> Also, it would be helpful if LWG provided a detailed listing of the
> discrepancies they have identified. As I mentioned on the phone, I
> did not use the tox classifications for the individual endpoints in my
>
> model development or evaluation (in the files I sent, rtox_hy and
> rtox_ch are the relevant endpoints for comparison with LWG's results).
>
> thanks,
> Jay
>
> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

All, I forwarded the hit/no-hit classifications that Jay prepared in February (attached) to John Toll so we can resolve any differences. Yesterday, John and Jim McKenna called me. Apparently, they were

unable

to verify the results. They identified two discrepancies with Jay's

hit

classifications.

1) Though it seemed that Jay tested for statistical difference from control, it did not appear that any hit classifications were

eliminated

based on this (i.e., based on no statistical difference from

control).

This affected 50 Chironomus survival results.
2) The T and C data match but the T/C does not match. At least 22 Hyalella biomass stations are affected.

I understand from Burt that this data has been verified in some way

by

the government team. However, I have not seen the results of the verification. I someone has an email or something that documents

this,

please send it to me.

John left a voice message with Jay. However, I am not sure Jay is around. Jay if you are checking email, can you provide some illumination. It might be good to give John Toll a call. He is at 206-812-5433. I would like this resolved asap. It seems that we

should

be able to quickly resolve any discrepancies on this fairly basic

topic

very quickly.

Thanks, Eric

(See attached file: CH10_Tox_100117.DBF)(See attached file: HY28_Tox_091001.DBF)

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov

[attachment "PH_RefTox_Thresholds_101031.doc" deleted by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US]

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov